



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of reaping some political or other advantage. It is not difficult to picture the reasons which French statesmen might give for delay. When it is discovered by our European friends that nothing is to be gained by waiting, however, the treaties will, in our judgment, be ratified forthwith.

A SLIGHT LACK OF PERSPECTIVE

AT A TIME when the world is so messy that statesmen find it impossible to handle the difficulties arising from day to day, Senator La Follette discovers that by a process of gradual encroachment the Federal courts of the country have "wrested sovereignty from the people." He proposes, therefore, an amendment to the Constitution denying the power of lower courts to set aside a Federal law as unconstitutional, and providing for the nullification of any such decision by the Supreme Court by the simple device of re-enactment by the Congress of the statute condemned by the court.

It would seem that there is enough for statesmen to do just now without tampering with the most fundamental thing in our American life. During the first eighty years of the Supreme Court, four acts of Congress were held to be unconstitutional. From 1869 to the present there have been 37 acts of Congress held to be unconstitutional. The chief reason for continuing this right on the part of the court is the chaos sure to follow if the separate courts of the States were to be the only arbiters as to the constitutionality of an act of Congress.

In 1870 a Kentucky court held the Legal-tender Act invalid, while at the same time courts of other States held the act to be valid. Such a lack of uniformity of interpretation would make Federal laws well-nigh impossible. Our history has shown that the Supreme Court, or a similar court, is necessary to determine questions as they arise concerning the constitutionality or unconstitutionality of State statutes. Its right to pass upon the constitutionality of an act of Congress has worked no injury to any fundamental or permanent policy of the United States.

The Supreme Court of the United States is 133 years old. Its establishment was provided for in Article III, section 1, of the Constitution. As a practical working system, it has met with the increasing approval of the people. Throughout the history of the court, its judges, removed from the passing whims of popular opinion, have discharged their duties with dignity and conspicuous ability. It is true, as pointed out by De Tocqueville, that "the peace, the prosperity, and very existence of the Union are placed in the hands of the judges. Without their co-operation, the Constitution would be a

dead letter; the executive appeals to them for protection against the encroachment of the legislative power; the legislature demands their protection against the designs of the executive; they defend the Union against the disobedience of the States; the States, from the exaggerated claims of the Union; the public interests against the interests of private citizens; and the conservative spirit of order against the innovations of an excited democracy."

But, perhaps, more impressive still are the measured words of Mr. Justice Field, who, on his resignation in 1897, said:

"As I look back over the more than a third of a century that I have sat on this bench, I am more and more impressed with the immeasurable importance of this court. Now and then we hear it spoken of as an aristocratic feature of a republican government. But it is the most democratic of all. Senators represent their States, and Representatives their constituents; but this court stands for the whole country, and as such it is truly 'of the people, by the people, and for the people.' It has, indeed, no power to legislate. It cannot appropriate a dollar of money. It carries neither the purse nor the sword. But it possesses the power of declaring the law, and in that is found the safeguard which keeps the whole mighty fabric of government from rushing to destruction. This negative power, the power of resistance, is the only safety of a popular government."

In this hour of the world's pain and travail we should need no Friar Laurence to remind us that "too swift arrives as tardy as too slow."

THE TWENTY-SECOND INTERNATIONAL PEACE CONGRESS

THERE are evidences that the Twenty-Second International Peace Congress, to be held in London July 25-29, is to be a much larger and more influential conference than that of Luxemburg, a year ago. It is the second congress to be held since the war. The third and seventeenth congresses of the series were held in London in 1890 and 1908 respectively. The twentieth was to have been held in the city of Vienna in August, 1914. The program of this London Conference, as already announced, includes addresses by the Lord Mayor of London, the Very Rev. Dean Inge, the Right Honorable Lord Parmoor, Sir George Paish, the Right Honorable J. R. Clynes, M. P., Lady Rhondda, Charles Trevelyan, Dr. Quidde, and others.

Preliminary announcements inform us that the procedure of the congress will be through resolutions prepared by the commissions, of which there are four, and reported to the congress by the chairman of each commission. The resolutions will then be debated and put

to the congress. Societies wishing to introduce resolutions on any of the subjects dealt with by the commissions are requested to send them in beforehand. The delegates are entitled to put their names down for the commission which they wish to attend. The commissions are to deal with the following subjects respectively: "The Economic Restoration of Europe," "The League of Nations," "The Control of Foreign Affairs through Parliaments," and Urgent Current Questions.

Those attending the congress may be:

(1) Delegates appointed by peace organizations or by other societies in sympathy with the objects of the congress.

(2) Delegates from certain institutions which subsidize the bureau.

(3) Individual members or adherents, not delegates.

(4) Persons invited by the bureau or by the organization committee.

Each member or delegate will be asked to pay a fee of five shillings. Peace societies and their branches with a minimum of thirty may send one voting delegate for every 100 members, up to twenty votes, a fraction of 100 to count as 100. Other societies are entitled to send not more than two voting delegates. Delegates and members requiring hospitality should apply early to the Hospitality Secretary, Peace Congress, 19 Buckingham Street, W. C. 2. We are told that, in allocating hospitality, preference will be given to foreign delegates. All societies in sympathy with the objects of the congress are invited to make an effort to send delegates and members. They are also asked to send names and addresses, with fees, as soon as possible to the secretary, address as already given.

We are told that the difficulties to be overcome are great, principally because the rates of exchange practically prohibit a journey to England from many European countries. To meet this difficulty, an International Traveling and Hospitality Fund has been opened by the International Peace Bureau, by means of which delegates from countries which would otherwise have no representation will be able to attend. The number of such visitors to whom invitations can be given will depend on the amount contributed to this fund, which will also have to cover incidental expenses of delegates. It is estimated that a sum of \$2,000 is necessary to carry out these objects efficiently. Friends of the American Peace Society wishing to contribute to this fund may make out their checks to the American Peace Society. Any such sums will be turned over to the authorities in London. If preferred, the checks may be made out to the International Peace Congress, endorsed National Provincial and Union Bank of England, Ltd., Charing Cross Branch.

The American Peace Society has already appointed the following persons as delegates to the Congress: Mr. and Mrs. Jackson H. Ralston, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Ramsay, Theodore Stanfield, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Deerin Call, and Miss Ethel Warner. If there are any other members of the American Peace Society able to attend this congress, they may receive their credentials by notifying the American Peace Society at once.

AMID the tohu and bohu of our world distress we grab eagerly for every morsel of comfort. It may be that Great Britain will make good her offer to return Wei-hai-wei to China, and that France may some day restore Kwang chow-wan. Yap, German cables, and Japanese mandates are no longer a source of worry. Perhaps Japan will withdraw her troops from Siberia; anyway, we are told that she has withdrawn her troops and gendarmes from Shantung, "the final contingent having sailed from Tsingtao on May 9. The Tsingtao garrison will itself be removed from the port simultaneously with the transfer of the administration of the leased territory to the Chinese authorities."

We are told that the Council of the League of Nations has made possible a "final settlement" of the Upper Silesian problem; that Albania is on the way to financial, economic, and legal stability, and that by act of the Council of the League of Nations any State which has not been invited to sign the covenant and which, therefore, was not invited to join the court, may now become a member of the court by depositing a statement with the Court Registrar that it wishes to do so, either in certain specific cases or in all cases. While this does not seem to include the United States, the Council adds: "To all intents and purposes, therefore, all nations are now given equal rights before this first World Court." But more arresting than anything before us at the moment is a note from the Far East. Out of India we have received these stirring words: "The European powers are still biting at each other. It is for India, fully armed with her superior spiritual power, to step in and quell this unrest. It is now the turn of the conquered to turn the conqueror. It is for India to proclaim, to prove, and to establish the supremacy of spiritual power, that the 'civilized' powers, who have so long known nothing but physical force, may be confounded and forced to say, 'All strength is the strength of the spirit; physical force is nowhere beside it. Cursed be physical force.'"

Our world can afford to recall that teaching of Buddha that any vital impulse loses its vitality unless leashed by a vital control. Men can escape from their sorrow in no other way except by the strenuous exercise of a *frein vital*—vital control.

THE USE of physical force as a means of coercion against States can be none other than a method of war. It is well to remind ourselves from time to time of this fact, for it is difficult to down the theory, still frequently advanced, that there is no hope for the peace of the world except in terms of an international organization with power to coerce States by force of arms. Mr. Edmund Burke, in his classic address on conciliation with the American colonies, saw this truth. Mr. Burke said: "Sir, permit me to observe that the use of force alone is but temporary. It may subdue for a moment, but it does not remove the necessity of subduing again; and a nation is not governed which is perpetually to be conquered." Going on to point out the uncertainty of force, the impairing effect upon the object against which it is used, he added: "Lastly, we have no sort of experience in favor of force as an instrument in the rule of our colonies."

WHEN, shortly after the Armistice, the writer asked Professor Bergson, the well-known French philosopher, what effect the war might be expected to have upon philosophy, the professor replied: "We do not yet know the causes of this war. Not until we know more of those causes can we forecast the effects the war may have upon philosophy." If the reply sound a bit oracular, it was nevertheless sane. Intelligent students of world affairs will not be satisfied until they know more of the subtle but tremendous forces that ended in the European holocaust.

There is a neutral commission formed to investigate the causes of the World War, with a secretariat at The Hague. It is announced that the work of the commission is about to begin. A special cable to the *New York Times*, under date of June 8, announced that a large sum of money from an American who desires to remain anonymous has been received by the commission for the promotion of its work. The correspondent adds that the ex-Kaiser is taking the keenest interest in the work of the commission. There is no reason why the Kaiser should be any more interested in the matter than the rest of us. There can be no successful efforts to establish a rational international peace disassociated from the causes of war.

AN INTERNATIONAL auxiliary language is the perennial hope of what seems to be an increasing number of men and women. A committee on an international auxiliary language, composed of John C. Rolfe, Edward C. Armstrong, and John Dewey, of the American Council of Learned Societies, has recently expressed the opinion that the present situation in international relations creates a more pressing need for such an aux-

iliary medium of communication than has existed in any preceding period. The committee also believes that it is desirable to arrive at a sufficient consensus of opinion of competent and authoritative bodies to secure the preponderance of some one among the existing or possible competing auxiliary languages and to avoid a repetition of the Babel already existing in the domain of the national languages.

Of course, the fact is that there is no general agreement upon any effective international auxiliary language. The scholars do not agree as to the best method of assuring to such a language an adequate elasticity and stability. Manifestly, the problem is a difficult one. It has been presented at international peace conferences, for example, for many years. Indeed, at a congress held in London in 1908 it was voted to make Esperanto the official language of the conference. It has not been referred to since. It is an international problem and as such manifestly too big for any national body.

The committee of the American Council of Learned Societies wisely confines itself to recommending to the executive officers of the American Council that its representatives at the approaching meeting of the International Union of Academies be requested to raise the question whether the Union desires to participate in the consideration of the problem of an auxiliary language, and to assure that body of the willingness of the American Council to co-operate in such an undertaking. It further recommends that, if the Union decide to take cognizance of the question, any committee or commission that be created to that end be authorized to confer and co-operate with the representatives of other organizations interested in the matter. The committee adds: "Pending the outcome of such a submission of the project to the approaching meeting, the committee deems it wiser to postpone recommendation of a specific solution."

THE RELATION of the United States to the League of Nations remains still a matter of conversation in some quarters. In the May number of *Our World* former Attorney General Wickersham, granting that the United States cannot become a member of the League and expressing the view that the League cannot be dropped, proceeds to argue that the American Government, without becoming a member of the League, ought to participate in the special activities of that organization. Our own view is that the United States will not and cannot, without sacrificing fundamental principles, recognize the existing League of Nations. The only hope for that organization, so far as the United States is concerned, is to resolve itself into an international conference organized and conducted according to the generally accepted principles of international conferences.